

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS Washington, D.C. 20231 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/446,276	12/21/1999	. YOSHIHISA NISHIBE	Q57234	2101
75	590 12/14/2001			_
SUGHRUE MION ZINN MACPEAK & SEAS 2100 PENNSYLVANIA AVENUE NW			EXAMINER	
			PULLIAM, AMY E	
WASHINGTO	N, DC 20037-3202		ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER	
			1615	17
			DATE MAILED: 12/14/2001	1 /

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)				
Advisory Action	09/446,276	NISHIBE ET AL.				
- Advisory Action	Examiner	Art Unit				
	Amy E Pulliam	1615				
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover she t with the	corr spond nce add	ress			
THE REPLY FILED 3 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE. Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to avoid abandonment of this application. A proper reply to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) a timely filed amendment which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee); or (3) a timely filed Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.						
PERIOD FOR REPLY [check either a) or b)]						
a) The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date of the final rejection. b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection. ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).						
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).						
1. A Notice of Appeal was filed on Appellant's Brief must be filed within the period set forth in 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 1.191(d)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal.						
2. The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered because:						
(a) They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);						
. (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see Note below);						
(c) they are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or						
(d) they present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.						
3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following reject	tion(s):					
4. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).						
5.⊠ The a) affidavit, b) exhibit, or c) request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: <u>See Continuation Sheet</u> .						
6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered be raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.	cause it is not directed SOLELY	to issues which we	ere newly			
7. For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment explanation of how the new or amended claims w	· · · · —	•	and an			
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:						
Claim(s) allowed:						
Claim(s) objected to:						
Claim(s) rejected: <u>1-30</u> .						
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:						
8. The proposed drawing correction filed on is	a) approved or b) disap	proved by the Exar	miner.			
9. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s)(PTO-1449) Paper No(s)						
10. Other:						



Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: the examiner finds the data non-persuasive. In the interview summary the examiner suggested that further data be submitted in order to show the criticality of the osmolarity and the insioluble substance. Additionally, in considering the newly organized data, the examiner again points out that the broad claims in the instant invention are drawn to an osmolarity of less than 290. However, the data, for example, table 1, shows that there is no critical difference above an osmolarity of 30. It is the position of the examiner that there is no significant difference between a bioaviability of 16 compared to 13 compared to 7%, especially without the benefit of stastical analysis. For these reasons, the rejection is maintined.

THITH WAVE PAGE
SUPERVISORY FATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 1600